

REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to an Office Action transmitted on November 1, 2007. Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19 were pending at the time of the Office Action. Claims 1 and 19 are currently amended. Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19 remain pending.

I. EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicant respectfully expresses appreciation to Examiner Tan Le for the telephone interview held on February 14, 2007, during which the Examiner discussed the disposition of this case with the undersigned attorney. Specifically, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed "adhesive" as recited in claims 1 and 19 and the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,042,080 to Shepherd et al. No Agreement was reached regarding the allowability of the claims.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AU Patent No. 200,223,231 to Nagle *et al.* (hereinafter "Nagle"), in view of U.S. 6,042,080 to Shepherd *et al.*, (hereinafter "Shepherd"), and further in view of U.S. 6,158,555 to Brown Jr, (hereinafter "Brown Jr."). Applicant submits that the claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A cable drop support system comprising:

- a base configured for attachment to an attachment surface, the base including at least one attachment device, wherein the attachment device is an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface;
- a cable receptacle attached to an end portion of the at least one segment, the cable receptacle having a generally U-shaped cross-section for receiving therein at least an intermediate portion of a cable;
- a control system operatively associated with the cable drop support system, the control system configured for receiving instructions communicated through at least one communication media;
- a portable communication device configured to provide instructions to the control system through the at least one communication media; and
- at least one mechanical drive mechanism operatively coupled to respond to the control system, the at least one mechanical drive mechanism configured to at least one of extend and retract the one or more segments.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because, among other reasons, Nagle fails to teach or suggest every aspect of claim 1. That is, as noted in the rejection, Nagle teaches a telescopic support pole, but does not disclose “wherein the attachment device is *an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface*,” as recited in claim 1. (Office Action, Page 3, Lines 5-7).

Second, the deficiencies of Nagle with respect to this element are not remedied by the teachings of Shepherd. Shepherd also does not teach “*an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface*,” as recited in claim 1. Instead, Shepherd discloses an adhesive that retains magnets 20 within a base 14. Specifically, the relevant section of Shepherd discloses:

FIG. 4 is a bottom view, with protective cover 26 shown in partial cutaway, outer housing 24 and partitions 25 rigidly attached to housing 24, and magnets 20. *Magnets 20 may be retained within the base 14 via adhesives, such as epoxy resin adhesives*, retaining pins which engage a complimentary hole or indentation within magnets 20, retaining posts, stops, bars, and the like, securing magnets 20 within housing 24. (Column 6, Lines 54-59; Figure 4).

In other words, the use of an adhesive to retain magnets within a base, (where the magnets provide attachment between the base and an attachment surface), is not equivalent to the use of an adhesive to attach a base to an attachment surface. Moreover, since Shepherd does not disclose any further use of an adhesive, Shepherd does not teach this element of claim 1.

Third, the deficiencies of Nagle with respect to this element are also not remedied by the teachings of Brown Jr. Brown Jr. discloses a control panel 16 that is generally mounted to the exterior of an vehicle. (Column 2, Lines 45-48). However, Brown Jr. is silent with respect to an adhesive that adheres a base to an attachment surface.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the cited references (Nagle, Shepherd, and Brown Jr.), whether individually or in combinations, fail to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest every aspect of claim 1. Moreover, since claims 5-8, 10-16, and 18 depend from claim 1, they are allowable at least due to their dependency, as well as due to the additional features each recites.

Claim 19

Claim 19, as amended, recites:

19. A cable drop support system comprising:
 - a base configured for attachment to an attachment surface, the base including at least one attachment device, wherein the attachment device is an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface, and wherein the attachment surface includes a surface portion area of a service vehicle;
 - a first segment connected to the base;
 - at least a second segment attached to the first segment, the first and second segments being structured in a telescoping configuration;
 - a cable receptacle attached to an end portion of one of the segments, the cable receptacle having a generally

- upwardly open U-shaped cross-section for receiving therein an intermediate portion of a cable and for supporting the intermediate portion of the cable;
- a control system operatively associated with the cable drop support system, the control system configured for receiving instructions communicated through at least a wireless communication media; and
- at least one mechanical drive mechanism operatively coupled to respond to the control system, the at least one mechanical drive mechanism configured to at least one of extend and retract the first and second segments.


Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references to Nagle, Shepherd, and Brown Jr., whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest, “wherein the attachment device is *an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface*,” as recited in Claim 19. (Emphasis added). Thus, Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2-18-08

By: 
Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58,293
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-4001 x104
or (206) 315-7914
Fax: (206) 315-4004